

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 4-8, 10-14, 16, 17, and 19-25 are currently pending
- Claims 1, 17, and 23 are amended herein

[0003] Support for the amendments to claims 1, 17, and 23 is found in the specification at least at page 16, lines 1-3, at page 26, lines 21-23, and at page 27, lines 7-10.

Cited Documents

[0004] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Smith: Smith et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028685
- Stoakley: Stoakley et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0045961
- Lakshminarayanan: Lakshminarayanan, "The .NET Schema Object Model," retrieved at <<<http://www.xml.com/1pt/a/1074>>> on 10/21/2007, O'Reilly Media, Inc., December 4, 2002, 17 pgs
- Powers: Powers, et al., "Visual Basic® Programmer's Guide to the .NET Framework Class Library," Sams, January 2, 2002

Claims 1, 4-8, 10-14, 16, 17, and 19-25 Are Non-Obvious Over Smith in View of Stoakley, Lakshminarayanan and Powers

[0005] Claims 1, 4-8, 10-14, 16, 17, and 19-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Smith in view of Stoakley, Lakshminarayanan and Powers. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0006] While Applicant disagrees with the rejection of claim 1, Applicant nonetheless offers amendments to claim 1 to advance prosecution and obtain allowance. In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is moot. Specifically, the cited references do not teach or suggest at least the claimed:

generating graphical objects using a first group of services, wherein the first group of services includes a service that customizes a behavior of the graphical objects to style and/or theme the graphical objects, the service including interfaces for controlling a behavior of a menu item, for controlling a visibility behavior of a scroll bar, and for controlling selection behavior of a listbox....

[0007] In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner pointed to paragraphs 30 and 57 of Smith as describing “the first group of services includes a service that determines a behavior of the graphical objects.” Of those portions, paragraph 30 describes XML. The Examiner equates the XML of Smith to the first services that determine behavior of graphical objects, stating that XML defines “behaviors” (which the Examiner equates to functions).

XML, however, is not a service and would not be recognized by anyone skilled in the art as a service. It can be used by a service, but Smith makes no mention of any service using XML to determine behaviors of graphical objects.

[0008] Further, claim 1 has now been amended to further define the first services. Now, claim 1 recites that the first services “includes a service that customizes a behavior of the graphical objects to style and/or theme the graphical objects” and that the service includes “interfaces for controlling a behavior of a menu item, for controlling a visibility behavior of a scroll bar, and for controlling selection behavior of a listbox.” Nothing in the XML discussed by paragraph 30 remotely suggests such first services. Paragraph 57, which describes a UI namespace denominated as System.Web.UI, mentions various user interface controls but makes no mention of customizing styles or themes of those UI controls. Also, paragraph 57 makes no mention of interfaces for controlling behaviors of specific types of graphic objects (i.e., menu items, scroll bars, and listboxes).

[0009] Consequently, the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 17 and 23

[0010] Claims 17 and 23 include recitations similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 17 and 23 are patentable over the cited references.

Dependent Claims 4-8, 10-14, 16, 19-22, 24, and 25

[0011] Claims 4-8, 10-14, 16, 19-22, 24, and 25 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 17, and 23. As discussed above, claims 1, 17, and 23 are patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 4-8, 10-14, 16, 19-22, 24, and 25 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

[0012] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/ _____ Dated: 9/30/2009

Robert C. Peck(robpe@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)

Registration No. 56826

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162)

Registration No. 53725